UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,839	03/31/2004	Hugh B. Svendsen	1104-062	6056

74548   7590   03/14/2008
FlashPoint Technology and Withrow & Terranova
100 Regency Forest Drive
Suite 160
Cary, NC 27518

EXAMINER
KIM, JUNG W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/813,839	SVENDSEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JUNG KIM	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 December 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-34_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-9,15-25 and 31-34_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _10-14 and 26-30_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office action is in response to the amendment filed on 12/17/07.

2.   Claims 1-34 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art rejections have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive. On pg. 10 of the Remarks, Applicant argues

that the Sit prior art does not anticipate all limitations of the independent claims because

Sit does not disclose "translating the HTTP request into a request packet and sending

the request packet to the peer server," but rather "Sit discloses wrapping a request sent

from a browser 314E to a web server 308I, which is behind a firewall 305, such that, to

the firewall 305, the request appears as a response from the browser 314E to a request

sent by the web server 308I." Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because the

term "translating the HTTP request into a request packet" under the broadest

reasonable interpretation standard does not appear to be limiting in the sense as

argued by the applicant. (MPEP 2111.01, "During examination, the claims must be

interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow ... This means that the words of

the claim must be given their plain meaning unless the plain meaning is inconsistent

with the specification") The term "translating," under the plain meaning of the term, is a

step to change into another form. The plain meaning of the term "request packet" is

interpreted as any packet including a request by a sender to a destination. (see any

dictionary) Hence a translation of a HTTP request into a request packet is any

modification to a HTTP request into a packet, where the packet is changed into another

form, and where the packet includes a request from a sender to a destination.

Moreover, this interpretation is consistent with the enabling portion of the Specification

(see paragraph 21). The Sit invention does exactly this procedure. In order to bypass a

firewall, a request packet is changed into a different packet by wrapping the request, the

wrapped request is transmitted through the firewall, then the header and trailer portions

of the packet are removed to reveal the original request packet and forwarded to the

destination. (col. 7:50-8:12) Hence, Sit discloses the limitation "translating the HTTP

request into a request packet"; for these reasons, applicant's arguments are not

persuasive. Claims 1-9, 15-25 and 31-34 remain rejected under the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   Claims 1-4 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by Sit et al. USPN 6,349,336 (hereinafter Sit).

5.   As per claims 1-4, Sit discloses a method for providing a Web browser running

on a computer with HTTP access to a peer server located behind a firewall in a peer-to-

peer network (col. 8:14-21), comprising; (a) providing the peer-to-peer network with a

proxy server (fig. 5); (b) registering an outbound socket connection with the proxy server

by the peer server (5:16-20); (c) in response to the proxy server receiving an HTTP

request to access the peer server from the Web browser, translating the HTTP request

into a request packet and sending the request packet to the peer server (7:50-60); and

(d) in response to the peer server receiving the request packet, translating the request

packet back into the HTTP request and responding to the request, thereby enabling

generic web traffic to flow (7:61-64);

6.   wherein the peer server further includes a Web server (fig. 5, reference nos.

308E and 308I), step (d) further including the steps of: (i) responding to request by

passing the HTTP request to the Web server; (ii) receiving an HTTP response from

Web server; (iii) translating HTTP response into a response packet; (iv) sending the

response packet from the peer server to the proxy server over the outbound socket

connection; (v) receiving the response packet on the proxy server and translating a

response packet back into the HTTP response; and (vi) sending the HTTP response

from the peer server to the Web browser; (7:64-68)

7.   wherein the peer-to-peer network includes multiple peer servers, and the proxy

server is separate and apart from the peer servers;(fig. 5, reference nos. 306 and 312)

8.   providing each of the peer servers with a peer node, a Web server, and a Web

browser. (fig. 5, reference nos. 308E, 310E, 314E, 308I, 310I and 314I)

9.   As per claims 17-20, they are claims corresponding to claims 1-4, and they do

not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 1-4. Therefore, claims 17-

20 are rejected as being anticipated by Sit for the same reasons set forth in the

rejections of claims 1-4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   Claims 5-7, 15, 16, 21-23 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sit.

11.   As per claims 5-7, the rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sit is incorporated herein. Sit does not expressly disclose providing the peer-to-peer network with a registration server and a DNS server; passing a name of the peer server from the peer server to the registration server, and receiving a name and IP address of the proxy server to which it is assigned; wherein step (b) further includes the step of: registering by the peer server, the name of the proxy server, and the IP address of the proxy server with the DNS server. However, these steps are conventional means of resolving domain names. DNS registration is the defacto means of mapping hostnames to IP addresses. Further, because a peer server is located behind the proxy server, the peer server needs to register with the DNS with information that it is assigned to the proxy server. Moreover, resolution of domain names requires the name of the proxy server and the IP address of the server. Examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the invention of Sit to further include the following steps: providing the peer-to-peer network with a registration server and a DNS server; passing a name of the peer server from the peer server to the registration server, and receiving a name and IP address of the proxy server to which it is assigned; wherein

step (b) further includes the step of: registering by the peer server, the name of the
proxy server, and the IP address of the proxy server with the DNS server. One would
be motivated to do so to enable a user to access a peer server behind a proxy agent
using a host name. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 5-7.

12.   As per claims 21-23, they are claims corresponding to claims 5-7, and they do
not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 5-7. Therefore, claims 21-
23 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sit for the same reasons set forth in the
rejections of claims 5-7.

13.   As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC 102(b) as being
anticipated by Sit is incorporated herein. Although Sit does not expressly disclose step
(d) further includes the step of: breaking the HTTP response into chunks and sending
the chunks to the proxy server in successive peer response packets, it is notoriously
well known in the art that data over a link is transmitted in limited size blocks of data to
enable reliable and efficient transmission of the message. Examiner takes Official
Notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art
at the time the invention was made for step (d) to further include the step of: breaking
the HTTP response into chunks and sending the chunks to the proxy server in
successive peer response packets. One would be motivated to do so to transmit
messages reliably and efficiently as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. The
aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 15.

14.   As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sit is incorporated herein. Although Sit does not expressly disclose

wherein the step (d) further includes the step of: providing the peer server with several

threads for handling HTTP requests from the proxy server, and multiplexing responses

to those requests over the same response socket back to the proxy server; conventional

servers are typically enabled to handle multiple requests simultaneously to prevent

bottlenecks caused by a single request. Furthermore, threading is achieved via

multiprocessing. Examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step

of (d) to further include the step of: providing the peer server with several threads for

handling HTTP requests from the proxy server, and multiplexing responses to those

requests over the same response socket back to the proxy server. One would be

motivated to do so to provide an efficient means of handling requests via

multiprocessing as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. The aforementioned cover

the limitations of claim 16.

15.   As per claims 31 and 32, they are claims corresponding to claims 15 and 16, and

they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 15 and 16.

Therefore, claims 31 and 32 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sit for the same

reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 15 and 16.

16.   As per claims 33 and 34, the limitations of these claims are covered by the

invention disclosed by Sit and the obvious enhancements as discussed in the prior art

rejections of claims 1-7, 15 and 16. Therefore, claims 33 and 34 are rejected as being

unpatentable over Sit for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 1-7, 15

and 16.

17.   Claims 8, 9, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sit in view of Gupta et al. USPN 6,917,965 (hereinafter Gupta).

18.   As per claims 8 and 9, the rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sit is incorporated herein. Sit does not disclose the step (b) further

includes the step of: after the peer server registers with the proxy server, notifying a

user of the computer via e-mail that content exists on the peer server for viewing, and

including a URL of the peer server in the e-mail; wherein step (b) further includes the

step of: in response to the user clicking on the URL e-mail, the computer contacts the

DNS server to determine an identity of the proxy server in which to send the HTTP

request. Gupta discloses means for presenting multimedia to users and presenting

annotations to the multimedia, whereby users are notified by email of new annotations,

whereby the emails notifying users of new annotations include a URL of the media

content. Col. 15:66-16:6. Such a feature provides a useful tool to notify users of new

content. Col. 2:5-21. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made for the method of Sit to further include the step of: after

the peer server registers with the proxy server, notifying a user of the computer via e-

mail that content exists on the peer server for viewing, and including a URL of the peer

server in the e-mail; wherein step (b) further includes the step of: in response to the

user clicking on the URL e-mail, the computer contacts the DNS server to determine an

identity of the proxy server in which to send the HTTP request (DNS is contacted to

resolve the URL to an IP address). One would be motivated to do so to provide a useful

tool to notify users of new content as taught by Gupta, ibid. The aforementioned cover

the limitations of claims 8 and 9.

19.   As per claims 24 and 25, they are claims corresponding to claims 8 and 9, and

they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 8 and 9. Therefore,

claims 24 and 25 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sit in view of Gupta for the

same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 8 and 9.

Allowable Subject Matter

20.   Claims 10-14 and 26-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

21.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Communications Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUNG KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-3804. The examiner can normally be reached on FLEX.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jung Kim/
Examiner, Art Unit 2132

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132